

### **REMARKS**

The present application amends claims 1, 14, 15 and 20 and leaves claims 2-11 and 16-18 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-11, 14-18 and 20.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action the Examiner objected to various informalities in claims 1-10, 15-18 and 20. Various amendments were made throughout claims 1-10, 15-18 and 20 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. These amendments are made so as to clarify the description of the present invention. Therefore, the objection to claims 1-10, 15-18 and 20 have been overcome and should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1-10, 14-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as the invention. Various amendments were made throughout claims 1-10, 14-18 and 20 to bring them into conformity with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Therefore, Applicants submit that this rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Particularly, amendments were made to claims 1-10, 14-18 and 20 so as to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner in paragraph 4 of the Office Action. These amendments are simply being made so as to clarify the description of the present invention.

The Examiner's cooperation is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' Attorney by telephone should any further indefinite matters be discovered so that appropriate amendments may be made.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication in paragraph 6 of the Office Action that claims 1-10, 15-18 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objections to the informalities and the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. As indicated above, amendments were made to claims 1-10, 15-18 and 20 so as to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner and bring the claims into conformity with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1-10, 15-18 and 20 are allowable as indicated by the Examiner.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Lei (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,552). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claim 14 are not taught or suggested by Lei whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to claim 14 so as to more clearly describe features of the present invention not taught or suggested by any of the references of record, particularly Lei, whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Specifically, amendments were made to claim 14 so as to more clearly recite the feature that the control unit receives a plurality of function programs. This feature of the present invention now more clearly recited in claim 14 was indicated by the Examiner as being one of the reasons for allowance for each of the other claims. The Examiner's attention is directed to page 5 of the Office Action in the fourth paragraph wherein the Examiner states that "the limitation of 'a control unit...wherein said control unit receives one of the function program from the server computer'" is

one of the reasons for allowance of the claims 1-10, 15-18 and 20. Since this limitation is now recited in claim 14, claim 14 now recites features identified by the Examiner as distinguishing the present invention from that taught by the references of record. Therefore, claim 14 is now allowable for the same reasons as the other claims 1-10, 15-18 and 20.

To further explain, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Lei wherein the control unit included in a disk unit, which is connectable to a client computer via network, receives a plurality of function programs which can be requested to be executed by the client computer as in the present invention. Lei simply discloses a method and mechanism for accessing data. At no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Lei that a plurality of function programs are sent to the disk unit and that execution of the function programs by the control unit of the disk unit can be requested as in the present invention.

Thus, as is quite clearly from the above, the features of the present invention now more clearly recited in claim 14 are not taught or suggested by Lei whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the above described rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Lei.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the reference utilized in the rejection of claim 14.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-11, 14-18 and 20 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-11, 14-18 and 20 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (501.38590X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



---

Carl I. Brundidge  
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc  
(703) 312-6600